

Robert Bauman

From: Jesus Armas
Sent: Wednesday, March 26, 2003 9:16 AM
To: Dennis Butler; Robert Bauman
Subject: FW: Comments on Meeting Packet for 238 Working Group

Here are the comments I mentioned yesterday.

-----Original Message-----

From: Sherman Lewis [mailto:slewis@csu Hayward.edu]
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2003 3:35 PM
To: Interested Parties Mission Foothill Issues
Subject: Comments on Meeting Packet for 238 Working Group

Comments on Meeting Packet for 238 Working Group meeting of
March 26

Sherman Lewis, Chair, HAPA, March 24, 2003

1. Relinquishment [R]
 - a. How specifically a few important examples do "local" and "highway" standard conflict?
 - b. How will Caltrans ownership of SRs 92 and 185 at the underpass affect design and procedural issues?
 - c. R creates a gap in the existing route. The whole route could be relinquished. This idea should be discussed with UC, Fremont and ACCMA.
 - d. Are "To SR 238" signs along the route being considered as a means for local ownership while retaining route identification?
 - e. Has Alameda County Public Works [PW] studied this issue and commented? PW could
 - i. support R of its section regardless of action on Hayward's R request
 - ii. support R of its section if Hayward's R is approved.
 - iii. oppose R even if approved for Hayward.
2. City County Coordination; issues at north end
 - a. The Hayward project shows lines in a bit of county area has this been approved by the county? Is there consultation going on?
 - b. The Hayward plan shows little change at the north end. The ramps could be realigned northerly to Ash St. to recover a parcel of land to meet housing or other needs. County Planning and HCD need to be involved in this issue along with PW. What is the County's position?
 - c. The Hayward project ignores, and appears to oppose, the completion of the interchange of 580 and 238, where a flyover ramp connecting west bound 580 to southbound 238 is needed to alleviate traffic at two interchanges in Castro Valley. The STIP includes funds for minor attachments of the I/C to the bypass and some funds for the flyover. The RTP includes the rest of the funds for the flyover. What is the County's position?
 - d. Seth Kaplan is a member of the Working Group. Should he be a free agent or represent on major points the position of Sup. Miley and the County? I think he would have more influence as a representative of the county [even though his appointment was by a City Council member]. Alternatively, county staff can attend and speak up for the county.
3. Parsons Group

Exhibit A

- a. What were the numbers from the June 2002 sketch study?
What was their range of error for the 6 v 8 lanes issue?
4. CEQA alternatives
 - a. The packet is ambiguous about variations and alternatives. On the one hand, "other modes ... be studied outside this alternative," and, on the other hand, "final configuration to be determined." HAPA supports studying a SmartGrowth variation which includes BURT [BART=CSUH BUS Rapid Transit]. This variation is not an alternative to the project as a whole under CEQA. It does, however, change one element of the project and includes an alternative mode that would be precluded or weakened by that one element as defined now. It is crucial for the SmartGrowth variation to be studied in the traffic analysis.
5. Traffic Model
 - a. What are the inputs? The inputs need to be able to include changes in housing and retail in the TAZs and new transit capacity based on SmartGrowth.
 - b. What are the modeling capabilities? The modeling capabilities need to include auto ownership, mode choice, and external screenline adjustments [I recommend Foothill north of Apple, Mission south of Harder, and Jackson east of Winton] to offset the Smart Growth. The model needs to report the range of error for each of its findings.
 - c. What are the outputs? The outputs need to include auto ownership, VMT, trips by mode [all trips and work trips; for DA, HOV3, TR, and Walk-bike], durations by purpose (HBW, HBS, HBSR, NHB or similar categories as used by the model), gallons of fuel consumption; cost of fuel; emissions of carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, and hydrocarbons; death and serious injury accidents, and minor accidents; CSUH enrollment and employment; retail attractions in study area, and level of service as defined in the annual LOS monitoring reports for the ACCMA.
 - d. Modeling needs to cover base year, alternative project, and variation on alternative project..
 - e. How will induced demand be considered?
 - f. Will the Working Group be able to review the TAZ map, trip tables, and other work products at the draft stage and comment before final model runs?
6. RFP Section I C.
 - a. Task 2. Does "etc." include the Working Group in general and HAPA in particular?
 - b. Task 3. The bullets do not include the requirements for traffic modeling specified above and are therefore inadequate for analysis of the variation. "Effectiveness" is too narrowly defined.
 - c. Task 3. I assume the analysis of adding one lane both ways is between City Center Dr. and Harder Rd. This variation should also be discussed in terms of all of the bullets in Task 3, not just "effectiveness" in the first bullet, to point out where there are differences from the proposed project. The other bullets are equally relevant for analyzing effectiveness..
 - d. There could be some discussion of the potential for a number of left turns with appropriate signal coordination to facilitate left turning as compared to prohibiting left turns and concentrating them at fewer intersections and thus prolonging the red cycle for through traffic [or worsening level of service for the left turns].
 - e. Task 6. There should also be some "relocation plan" so that the reasons for the cost estimate for relocation assistance is explained.

- f. Task 7. Construction issues should also be discussed for the variation, at least in summary form as to differences from the proposed project.
 - g. Task 9. Will there be any accommodation for the viewpoints of the members of the Working Group at work sessions and public meetings?
- 7. RFP Section II B.
 - a. The RFP has been written, circulated, had proposals submitted, and possibly had proposals reviewed without input from the Working Group. The criteria for review exclude comments by the Working Group.